



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,592	02/05/2001	Frederick W. Ryan JR.	F-235	3158
919	7590	08/19/2005	EXAMINER	
PITNEY BOWES INC. 35 WATERVIEW DRIVE P.O. BOX 3000 MSC 26-22 SHELTON, CT 06484-8000			BASS, JON M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/777,592	Applicant(s) RYAN, FREDERICK W.	
	Examiner Jon Bass	Art Unit 3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to an amendment filed on May 11, 2005 for a patent application filed on February 05, 2001. In the amendment, claims 1,5, 6, 8-10 and 12-20 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants arguments filed on May 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach the inventive concept of mail piece verification that comprises a "data center in communication with a processing center". The applicant also mentions that Cordery et al '921 fails to describe account files that corresponds to the postage metering system, wherein the data center is for storing reset data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the characteristics described by the applicant for the following reasons. Cordery et al '921 teaches in {column 7, lines 52-55} that the data center includes an authentication box that shares different secret keys and also executes the authentication algorithms to authenticate a mailer. Cordery further explains in {column 5, lines 45-52} that accounting method that is suitable for a virtual postage metering system is a real time payment method. Additionally Cordery et al '921 is not limited to just the above descriptions. He also is directed to a virtual postage metering system that can be used to generate the evidence of postage. In Cordery et al '921, digital data security for a Data Center of the virtual postage

metering system prevents inadvertent and international modifications to meter and user data stored at the Data Center. In Cordery et al `921 security boxes are used to protect against unauthorized alteration of meter and user records stored at the data center. Cordery et al `921 also provides secure control of digital token generation process and the associated secure accounting for each postage evidencing transaction occurring at the data center, explained in {column 4, 14-23}.

Applicant argues that the prior art doesn't disclose the concept of mail piece verification. According to Cordery et al `921 {column 6, lines 1-5} the data center receives the postal information, determines the zip for the mail piece, which shows that a verification method is taking place on a mail item. In conclusion the novelty in the claimed invention relates to mail piece verification of the postage and has a postage meter system for preparing mail pieces. Therefore all rejections remain due to the documented reasons from the first Office action in conjunction with the above explanation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for

patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1, 8, 15 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robert Cordery et al. (US Patent No. 6,446,921), hereafter referenced as Cordery.

As per Claim 1

Cordery discloses a system and method comprising: A mail piece verification system for processing mail pieces, the mail pieces having associated therewith respective mail piece data, the system comprising:

A data center in operative communication with a plurality of mail processing centers, the data center including a plurality of account files corresponding to the plurality of postage metering systems; and wherein the data center is for: (fig 1, element 30, transaction data center).

storing reset data in each of the plurality of account files representative of reset activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems, respectively; (col. 4, lines 16-17; stored at data center).

receiving respective mail piece data corresponding to the mail pieces from the plurality of mail processing centers; using the respective mail piece data, storing empirical data in each of the plurality of account files representative of mailing activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems, respectively; and (col. 8, lines 8-12; receives request from meter database).

conducting a forensic accounting analysis of the empirical data and the reset data associated with a selected postage metering system. (col.. 4, lines 43-48; evidencing transaction data and stored authenticated records).

As per Claim 8

Cordery discloses a system and method comprising: A method of operating a mail piece verification system for processing mail pieces, the mail pieces having associated therewith respective mail piece data, the method comprising:

receiving mail pieces at a plurality of mail processing centers that have been prepared by a plurality of postage metering systems; (col..8, lines 8-12, receives request from meter database).

obtaining the respective mail piece data from the mail pieces;

maintaining a plurality of account files corresponding to the plurality of postage metering systems;

storing reset data in each of the plurality of account files representative of reset activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems, respectively; (col. 4, lines 16-17, stored at data center).

using the respective mail piece data, storing empirical data in each of the plurality of account files representative of mailing activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems, respectively; and (col. 4, lines 16-17, stored at data center).

conducting a forensic accounting analysis of the empirical data and the reset data associated with a selected postage metering system. (col.. 4, lines 43-48; evidencing transaction data and stored authenticated records).

As per Claim 15

Cordery discloses a system and method comprising: A method of operating a data center for processing data associated with mail pieces and a plurality of postage metering systems for preparing mail pieces, the method comprising:

obtaining reset data representative of reset activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems; (col. 4, lines 16-17, stored at data center).

obtaining empirical data representative of mailing activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems; and

conducting a forensic accounting analysis of the empirical data and the reset data associated with a selected postage metering system. (col. 4, lines 16-17, stored at data center).

As per Claim 21

Cordery discloses a system and method comprising:

A data structure comprising:

a plurality of account files corresponding to a plurality of postage metering systems, each of the plurality of account files including:

a serial number identifying a respective one of the plurality of postage metering systems;

reset data representative of reset activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems, respectively; and

empirical data in each of the plurality of account files representative of mailing activity associated with the plurality of postage metering systems, respectively. (col. 4, lines 24-32; security issues for postage metering systems including uses for authentication databases and stored records).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-10, 12-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert Cordery et al. (US Patent

No. 6,466,921) and further in view of Robert Cordery (391) et al. (US Patent No. 6,526,391) (hereinafter referred as to Cordery 391).

As per Claim 2

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis (col. 4, lines 37-40), the subset defines a combination of the postage parameters for the generation of postage evidence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis, the subset defines a combination of the postage parameters for the generation of postage evidence, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col. 4, lines 37-40).

As per Claim 3

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the data center initiates responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the data center initiates responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system (col.4, lines 44-54), postage evidence is inhibited when parameter does not match.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the data center initiates responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data

for the selected postage metering system, postage evidence is inhibited when parameter does not match, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 44-54),

As per Claim 5

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number; the responsive action includes issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; and the data center provides instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number while allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number; the responsive action includes issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; and the data center provides instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the Existing serial number while allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number (col. 4, lines 37-47), defines a combination of postage parameters.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number; the responsive action includes issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; and the data center provides instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number while allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number defines a combination of postage parameters, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col. 4, lines 37-47).

As per Claim 6

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number; the responsive action includes issuing a new serial

number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; and the data center provides instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number while allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number; the responsive action includes issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; and the data center provides instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number while allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number (col. 4, lines 37-47), defines a combination of postage parameters.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number; the responsive action includes issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; and the data center provides instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number while allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number defines a combination of postage parameters, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col. 4, lines 37-47).

As per Claim 7

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein, the responsive action includes issuing instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to increase a sample rate for mail pieces including mail piece data corresponding to the selected postage metering system.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein, the responsive action includes issuing instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to increase a sample rate for mail pieces including mail piece data corresponding to the selected postage metering system (col.4, lines 21-24), postage metering system dispense on certain numbers and days.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the responsive action includes issuing instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to increase a sample rate for mail pieces including mail piece data corresponding to the selected postage metering system, postage metering system dispense on certain numbers and days, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 21-24) .

As per Claim 9

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis (col. 4, lines 37-40), the subset defines a combination of the postage parameters for the generation of postage evidence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis, the subset defines a combination of the postage parameters for the generation of postage evidence, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col. 4, lines 37-40).

As per Claim 10

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein further comprising: initiating responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein further comprising the step(s) of: initiating responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system (col.4, lines 44-54), postage evidence is habited when parameters does not match.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, further comprising the step(s) of: initiating responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system, postage evidence is habited when parameters does not match, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 44-54).

As per Claim 12

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number, the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and instructing the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number, and further comprising the step(s) of: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and instructing the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number (col.4, lines 37-54), the subset defines a combination of the postage evidence, parameters.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number, and further comprising the step(s) of: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and instructing the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number

the subset defines a combination of the postage evidence, parameters, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 37-54).

As per Claim 13

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number, the method further comprising the step(s) of: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;
allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and
instructing the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number, and further comprising the step(s) of: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;
allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and
instructing the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the old serial number (col.4, lines 37-54), the subset defines a combination of the postage evidence, parameters.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number, and further comprising the step(s) of: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number; allowing normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and instructing the plurality of mail processing centers to withhold processing of mail pieces containing the old serial number the subset defines a combination of the postage evidence, parameters, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 37-54).

As per Claim 14

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein, the responsive action includes issuing instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to increase a sample rate for mail pieces including mail piece data corresponding to the selected postage metering system.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein, the responsive action includes issuing instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to increase a sample rate for mail pieces including mail piece data corresponding to the selected postage metering system (col.4, lines 21-24), postage metering system dispense on certain numbers and days.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the responsive action includes issuing instructions to the plurality of mail processing centers to increase a sample rate for mail pieces including mail piece data corresponding to the selected postage metering system, postage metering system dispense on certain numbers and days, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 21-24) .

As per Claim 16

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis (col. 4, lines 37-40), the subset defines a combination of the postage parameters for the generation of postage evidence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the data center uses a previously defined time period over which to conduct the forensic accounting analysis, the subset defines a combination of the postage parameters for the generation of postage evidence, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col. 4, lines 37-40).

As per Claim 17

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein further comprising: initiating responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein further comprising: initiating responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system (col.4, lines 44-54), postage evidence is habited when parameters does not match.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, further comprising the step(s) of: initiating responsive action if the forensic accounting analysis reveals that the empirical data is not consistent with the reset data for the selected postage metering system, postage evidence is habited when parameters does not match, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 44-54).

As per Claim 19

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;

Providing instructions to allow normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and

Providing instructions withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;

Providing instructions to allow normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and

Providing instructions withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number. (col.4, lines 37-54), the subset defines a combination of the postage evidence, parameters.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the selected selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;

Providing instructions to allow normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and providing instructions withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number. which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 37-54).

As per Claim 20

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;

Providing instructions to allow normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and

Providing instructions withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system wherein the selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;

Providing instructions to allow normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and

Providing instructions withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number. (col.4, lines 37-54), the subset defines a combination of the postage evidence, parameters.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery's method and system in conjunction with Cordery (391)'s system to emulate an invention that deals with, the selected selected postage metering system includes an existing serial number the method further comprising: issuing a new serial number to the selected postage metering system to replace the existing serial number;

Providing instructions to allow normal processing of mail pieces containing the new serial number; and providing instructions withhold processing of mail pieces containing the existing serial number. which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (col.4, lines 37-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 11 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert Cordery et al. (US Patent No. 6,466,921) as applied to in view Robert Cordery (391) et al. (US Patent No.6,526,391) in further view of Thomas Wells et al (US Pub 2001/0032881) hereinafter referenced as Wells.

As per Claim 4

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the responsive action includes conducting an inspection.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system but lacks wherein selected postage metering system.

Wells discloses a method and system wherein the responsive action includes conducting an inspection of the selected postage metering system (page 1[0006]), to perform mail verification.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery and Cordery (391)'s method and system in conjunction with Well's system to emulate an invention that deals with, the responsive action includes conducting an inspection of the selected postage metering system, to perform mail verification, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (page 1[0006]).

As per Claim 11

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the responsive action includes conducting an inspection.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system but lacks wherein selected postage metering system.

Wells discloses a method and system wherein the responsive action includes conducting an inspection of the selected postage metering system (page 1[0006]), to perform mail verification.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery and Cordery (391)'s method and system in conjunction with Well's system to emulate an invention that deals with, the responsive action includes conducting an inspection of the selected postage metering system, to perform mail verification, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (page 1[0006]).

As per Claim 18

Cordery discloses a method and system but lacks wherein the responsive action includes conducting an inspection.

Cordery (391) discloses a method and system but lacks wherein selected postage metering system.

Wells discloses a method and system wherein the responsive action includes conducting an inspection of the selected postage metering system (page 1[0006]), to perform mail verification.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cordery and Cordery (391)'s method and system in conjunction with Well's system to emulate an invention that deals with, the responsive action includes conducting an inspection of the selected postage metering system, to perform mail verification, which additionally verifies the product data and its origin (page 1[0006]).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee


pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

No claim is allowed.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jon Bass whose telephone number is 571-272-6905.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOHN W. HAYES
PRIMARY EXAMINER